

**Version with Markings to Show Changes Made**

1. (Amended) Apparatus to adapt a common telephone for operation as a speakerphone, comprising:

a loudspeaker;

a microphone;

an audio module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone to adapt said common telephone for operation as a speakerphone.

16. (Amended) A method of converting a common telephone into a speakerphone, comprising:

removing a handset connection between a handset and a base of a telephone; and

temporarily connecting a loudspeaker and a microphone to said handset connection on said base to convert said common telephone into a speakerphone.

20. (Amended) Apparatus for converting a common telephone into a speakerphone, comprising:

means for removing a handset connection between a handset and a base of said telephone; and

means for temporarily connecting a loudspeaker and a microphone to said handset connection on said base to convert said common telephone into a speakerphone.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 16 and 20 are amended herein. Claims 1-25 remain pending in the application.

**Claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 13, 16 and 20 over Young**

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Young U.S. Patent No. 4,682,957 (“Young”), with claim 15 rejected as obvious over Young in view of well known prior art (“WKPA”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 13 and 15 recite, *inter alia*, an audio module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone to adapt a common telephone for operation as a speakerphone. Claims 16 and 20 recite, *inter alia*, temporarily connecting a loudspeaker and a microphone to a handset connection on a base to convert a common telephone into a speakerphone.

Young appears to teach a live presentation composed of audio and video given at one remote location by use of standard telephone service (Abstract). A presentation package is prepared and transmitted in advance of a presentation to the remote location (Young, Abstract). The transmission is by mail, courier or non-realtime electronic transmission (Young, Abstract). Presenting equipment at the remote location is used to connect the remote location to an originating location (Young, Abstract). Oral presentation is transmitted from the originating location to the remote location during the presentation (Young, Abstract). Speakerphone circuitry accepts input signals from a microphone and directs those to a telephone line for transmission to the remote location or from the remote location to a speaker (Young, col. 5, lines 25-33).

Young’s presentation equipment is pre-configured with permanent hardwired speakerphone circuitry to allow audio interaction during a presentation. Young fails to teach an audio module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone, much less an audio

module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone to adapt a common telephone for operation as a speakerphone, as claimed by claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 13 and 15.

Young's loudspeaker and microphone are part of presentation equipment that is pre-configured with permanent hardwired speakerphone circuitry. Young fails to teach temporarily connecting a loudspeaker and a microphone, much less temporarily connecting a loudspeaker and a microphone to a handset connection on a base to convert a common telephone into a speakerphone, as claimed by claims 16 and 20.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 13, 15, 16 and 20 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Claims 2, 3, 14, 17-19 and 21-23 over Young in view of Norris**

In the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 14, 17-19 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Young in view of Norris U.S. Patent No. 4,930,156 ("Norris"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 2, 3, 14, 17-19 and 21-23 are dependent on claims 1, 16 and 20 respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 16 and 20.

Claims 2, 3 and 14 recite, *inter alia*, an audio module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone to adapt a common telephone for operation as a speakerphone. Claims 17-19 and 21-23 recite, *inter alia*, temporarily connecting a loudspeaker and a microphone to a handset connection on a base to convert a common telephone into a speakerphone.

As discussed above, Young fails to teach an audio module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone to adapt a common telephone for operation as a speakerphone or temporarily connecting a loudspeaker and a microphone, much less temporarily connecting a loudspeaker and a microphone to a handset connection on a base to convert a

common telephone into a speakerphone, as respectively claimed by claims 2, 3, 14, 17-19 and 21-23.

Norris appears to teach a telephone speaker/microphone device for suspending in a user's ear to enable hands-free communication (Abstract). Control circuitry interconnects a microphone and speaker leads from a telephone to a speaker element and microphone element in a single earpiece (Norris, Abstract).

Norris teaches an earpiece for telephone communication. Norris fails to even mention a speakerphone.

Neither Young nor Norris, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest an audio module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone to adapt a common telephone for operation as a speakerphone, as claimed by 2, 3, and 14. Moreover, neither Young nor Norris, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest temporarily connecting a loudspeaker and a microphone to a handset connection on a base to convert a common telephone into a speakerphone, as claimed by claims 17-19 and 21-23.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 2, 3, 14, 17-19 and 21-23 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

#### **Claims 6-11 over Young in view of Eppler**

In the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 14, 17-19 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Young in view of Eppler Jr. et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,600,714 ("Eppler"). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 6-11 are dependent on claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 6-11 recite, *inter alia*, an audio module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone to adapt a common telephone for operation as a speakerphone.

As discussed above, Young fails to teach an audio module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone to adapt a common telephone for operation as a speakerphone, as respectively claimed by claims 6-11.

Eppler appears to teach the addition of a hybrid echo canceler into a conventional speakerphone (Eppler, Abstract; Fig. 2).

Eppler's speakerphone circuitry is pre-configured with permanent hardwired circuitry. Eppler fails to teach an audio module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone, much less an audio module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone to adapt a common telephone for operation as a speakerphone, as claimed by claims 6-11.

Neither Young nor Eppler, either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest an audio module adapted for removable interfacing to a handset jack of a base unit of a telephone to adapt a common telephone for operation as a speakerphone, as claimed by 6-11.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 6-11 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

#### **Claims 24 and 25 over Young in view of Norris, Eppler and WKPA**

In the Office Action, claims 24 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Young in view of Norris, Eppler and WKPA. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 24 and 25 recite, *inter alia*, a communication device having a voice paging mode of operation and a speakerphone mode of operation.

As discussed above, Young appears to teach a live presentation composed of audio and video given at one remote location by use of standard telephone service (Abstract). A presentation package is prepared and transmitted in advance of a presentation to the remote location (Young, Abstract). The transmission is by mail, courier or non-realtime electronic transmission (Young, Abstract). Presenting equipment at the remote location is

used to connect the remote location to an originating location (Young, Abstract). Oral presentation is transmitted from the originating location to the remote location during the presentation (Young, Abstract). Speakerphone circuitry accepts input signals from a microphone and directs those to a telephone line for transmission to the remote location or from the remote location to a speaker (Young, col. 5, lines 25-33).

As discussed above, Norris appears to teach a telephone speaker/microphone device for suspending in a user's ear to enable hands-free communication (Abstract). Control circuitry interconnects a microphone and speaker leads from a telephone to a speaker element and microphone element in a single earpiece (Norris, Abstract).

As discussed above, Eppler appears to teach the addition of a hybrid echo canceler into a conventional speakerphone (Eppler, Abstract; Fig. 2).

None of the cited prior art teaches a communication device having two modes of operation, much less a communication device having a voice paging mode of operation and a speakerphone mode of operation, as claimed by claims 24 and 25.

Neither Young, Norris, Eppler nor WKPA either alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest a communication device having a voice paging mode of operation and a speakerphone mode of operation, as claimed by claims 24 and 25.

Accordingly, for at least all the above reasons, claims 24 and 25 are patentable over the prior art of record. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

William H. Bollman  
Reg. No. 36,457

**Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC**  
2000 M Street, NW  
Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036-3307  
TEL. (202) 261-1020  
FAX. (202) 887-0336

WHB/df